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It has become a staple of research on Reported Speech (RS) that there is no strict separation between Direct Speech, as a literal rendering of the original discourse, and Indirect Speech, “a loose rendering of the original [discourse]” (Jäger 2010). Rather, there is a (deictic) continuum that gradually moves along different types of RS-marking (cf., e.g., Plank 1986, Coulmas 1986, von Roncador 1988, Günthner 2000, Vliegen 2010). Somewhat new, however, is the idea that this continuum also holds between forms of RS and forms of Reportive Evidentiality (REvi), roughly defined as the marking of propositional content as second-hand verbal information (hearsay), i.e. as stemming from an information source or (referred) speaker that is not the current (referring) speaker in the actual speech event (cf. Mortelmans & Vanderbiesen 2011). The distinguishing criterion usually remains the same: the more forms move to the reportive-evidential pole of the continuum, the more the voice of the original speaker is given up (e.g. Chojnicka 2012). The present paper, however, will show by means of corpus data that the ‘Originality Criterion’ must be abandoned, and that instead one should assume there is always a measure of the referring speaker present in each instance of RS and REvi. The question thus is no longer ‘who is speaking’, but ‘how does the referring speaker perspectivise the information’.

In order to capture this shift terminologically, Diewald & Smirnova’s (2010) dichotomy between ‘Quotatives’ and ‘Reportives’ is dynamicised. Their distinction is motivated by a consideration of the deictic anchoring of the research question: Quotatives shift the perspective to the “original” or referring speaker, whereas Reportives place the focus on the “current” or referring speaker. Considering the reorientation of the research question, these terms are no longer viewed as being strictly separate, but rather as poles on a continuum, bracketing constructions with a different measure of ‘Quotativity’ and ‘Reportivity’. The paper will attempt to define these new coinages, and show how even construction types that are in general described as having a high degree of Quotativity (i.e. roughly of referred speaker orientation), for instance Direct Speech, often occur in constructions with distinctly reportive elements, and vice versa. Thus, the referring speaker has a degree of liberty to represent “reported” information with a nuanced and subtle blend of different perspectives to suit different intentions.

The present paper will use German newspaper data, culled from a manually composed corpus of broadsheets, tabloids and regional newspapers, to illustrate the points made. In German, RS is marked by a wide variety of means, most famous among them the present subjunctive (ex. 1a), and Reportive Evidentiality is usually attributed to specific forms of the modal verb sollen ‘should’ (ex. 1b). Additionally, German has forms of the modal verb wollen ‘will’ that are defined precisely by their inherent hybrid nature as a blend of both quotative and reportive elements (ex. 1c).

(1)

a. Der Sprecher sagte, dass der Präsident heute eine Rede gehalten habe.
   The spokesman said that the president delivered a speech today.

b. Der Präsident soll heute eine Rede gehalten haben.
   The president is said to have delivered a speech today.

c. Der Präsident will heute eine Rede gehalten haben.
   The president claims to have delivered a speech today.
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